

## **Section M – Evaluation Factors for Award**

### **M-1. BASIS FOR CONTRACT AWARD**

**M-1.1.** This competitive best value source selection will be conducted IAW Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Part 15, Contracting by Negotiation, Department of Defense (DOD) Source Selection Procedures and Air Force Federal Acquisition Regulation (AFFARS) Mandatory Procedures (MP) 5315.3 for Source Selection using the Tradeoff source selection process. Award will be made to the offeror who is deemed responsible in accordance with FAR Part 9 and whose proposal conforms to the solicitation's requirements and is judged, through an integrated assessment of the specific evaluation criteria, to represent the best value to the Government.

**M-1.2.** The Government contemplates award of a single award IDIQ contract resulting from this solicitation and intends to select only one contractor for this acquisition and all associated task orders. After award of the IDIQ contract, task orders will be issued based on fully loaded labor rates incorporated into the contract. However, the Government reserves the right not to award a contract or any task orders, depending on the quality of proposal(s) submitted and the availability of funds. Evaluation will be conducted as outlined in M-2.

**M-1.3.** In order to be eligible for award, offerors are required to meet all solicitation requirements, such as terms and conditions; representations and certifications; evaluation factor requirements; and be deemed responsible in accordance with FAR Part 9.

**M-1.4.** The Government reserves the right to award without discussions, but may conduct discussions if the Government determines it is necessary. If the Government elects to open discussions, the competitive range may include proposals rated as "Unacceptable" at the sole discretion of the Government. The Government may make a final determination as to whether the Offeror's proposal is acceptable or unacceptable solely on the basis of the initial proposal submitted. If required, the competitive range may be further reduced for purposes of efficiency pursuant to FAR 15.306(c)(2). Therefore, Offerors are advised to submit proposals that are fully and clearly acceptable without additional information.

**M-1.5.** If the Government holds discussions, the Government may issue evaluation notices to Offerors in the competitive range. Formal responses to evaluation notices and final proposal revisions will be considered in making the source selection decision for award.

**M-1.6. Final Proposal Revision (FPR).** Final Proposal Revisions (FPR) will be requested from each Offeror in the competitive range at the conclusion of discussions. Any revision or non-concurrence to contract terms and conditions submitted in the FPR may not be subject to further discussion or negotiation. This provision is not intended to restrict the Offeror's opportunity to revise figures (e.g., prices, discounts, percentages, rates, etc.); rather, it is intended to preclude any misunderstandings by the Government which could result if new or revised terms and conditions are submitted in the FPR that have not been fully disclosed, discussed and understood during discussions. Hence, such new or revised terms and conditions are not solicited and, if submitted in the FPR, may render the offer unacceptable to the Government.

### **M-2. EVALUATION FACTORS AND METHODOLOGY**

**M-2.1. Evaluation Factors.** Proposals will be evaluated using four evaluation factors: (1) Technical Capability, (2) Past Performance, (3) Price and (4) Small Business Participation. Technical Capability is most important with Past Performance and Price of less but equal importance. Small Business is less

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY  
SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION – SEE FAR 2.101 AND 3.104

important than Past Performance and Price. The greater the equality of technical proposals the more important Past Performance and Price becomes in selecting the best value for the Government.

**M-2.2. Factor 1: Technical Capability (Technical & Risk).** Offerors' proposals shall demonstrate a comprehensive understanding of the nature and scope of work required. The Government will not search for data to cure problems or address inconsistencies in an Offeror's proposal. There are three (3) subfactors under the Technical Capability evaluation factor. They are Program Management, Operations and Maintenance and Transition. The Program Management and Operations and Maintenance subfactors are equal in importance and are the most important subfactors. Transition is the least important subfactor.

**M-2.2.1. Technical Rating.** The Technical proposals will be measured against evaluation criteria at the subfactor level. Technical subfactor ratings are determined based on the Strengths, Weaknesses, and Deficiencies of the offeror's technical solution for meeting the government's requirement. Each subfactor shall be assigned a color rating, shown below, as defined in the DoD Source Selection Procedures. The subfactor ratings will not be rolled up to an overall color rating for Technical factor. Each subfactor will be evaluated for strengths, weaknesses or deficiencies. These findings will determine the overall rating for each subfactor.

Technical Capability Ratings		
Color	Rating	Description
Blue	Outstanding	Proposal indicates an exceptional approach and understanding of the requirements and contains multiple multiple strengths.
Purple	Good	Proposal indicates a thorough approach and understanding of the requirements. Proposal contains at least one strength.
Green	Acceptable	Proposal indicates an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements.
Yellow	Marginal	Proposal has not demonstrated an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements.
Red	Unacceptable	Proposal does not meet requirements of the solicitation and, thus, contains one or more deficiencies and is unawardable.

**M-2.2.2. Technical Risk Rating.** The technical risk rating focuses on the weaknesses associated with an offeror's approach. Risk is assessed at the subfactor level, and includes an assessment of the potential for disruption of schedule, increased costs, degradation of performance, the need for increased Government oversight, and/or the likelihood of unsuccessful contract performance based on the offeror's identified approach and/or processes. In conducting the risk assessment, the Government will also consider information provided by the offeror in its proposal as to how the contractor will manage and mitigate risk. Proposal risk will be evaluated using the following ratings as defined in the DoD Source Selection Procedures.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY  
SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION – SEE FAR 2.101 AND 3.104

<b>Technical Risk Ratings</b>	
Rating	Description
Low	Proposal may contain weakness (es) which have little potential to cause disruption of schedule, increased cost or degradation of performance. Normal contractor effort and normal Government monitoring will likely be able to overcome any difficulties.
Moderate	Proposal contains a significant weakness or combination of weaknesses which may potentially cause disruption of schedule, increased cost or degradation of performance. Special contractor emphasis and close Government monitoring will likely be able to overcome difficulties.
High	Proposal contains a significant weakness or combination of weaknesses which is likely to cause significant disruption of schedule, increased cost or degradation of performance. Is unlikely to overcome any difficulties, even with special contractor emphasis and close Government monitoring.
Unacceptable	Proposal contains a material failure or combination of significant weaknesses that increases the risk of unsuccessful performance to an unacceptable level.

**M-2.2.3. Technical Subfactors**

**M-2.2.3.1. Subfactor A: Program Management.**

**M-2.2.3.1.1. Management and Integration.** The offeror's proposal will be evaluated on the following:

- i. An effective integrated management approach that demonstrates an organizational structure that consists of an appropriate leadership hierarchy, manning levels by position, skill sets by position, utilization of personnel to include specifics on any specific plans for cross-utilization, assigned roles and responsibilities, lines of authority, and cohesive functional relationships to meet provided workload data and execute all PWS requirements.
- ii. A comprehensive communication approach that consists of effective lines of communication, reporting, progress checkpoints, and interfaces between management, technical staff, subcontractors/teaming partners, and the Government to ensure continuity and mission success.
- iii. An effective system(s) for scheduling of tasks and system of controls to provide quality/timely services or products that safely fulfill mission requirements.

**M-2.2.3.1.2. Human Resources.** The offeror's proposal will be evaluated on the following:

- i. An effective integrated approach to attract, train, and retain qualified management and technical personnel by job category/position to execute all PWS requirements.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY  
SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION – SEE FAR 2.101 AND 3.104

- ii. Effective training approach to ensure required initial, qualification, proficiency, certification, and recurring training actions are taken to provide and maintain a qualified workforce with no interruption in service.
- iii. Demonstrates a comprehensive plan for creating and maintaining a work environment creating incentive for employee performance and innovation.

**M-2.2.3.1.3. Quality Management System.** The offeror's proposal will be evaluated on the following:

- i. Documented AS9100 and/or AS9110 registration/certification.
- ii. Effective approach to immediately implement and sustain AS9100 or AS9110 QMS from corporate management throughout the RPA contractor Operations and Maintenance team and workforce to meet or exceed all PWS requirements with focus on service summary metrics and conformance to Appendix G of the PWS.

**M-2.2.3.2. Subfactor B: Operations & Maintenance**

**M-2.2.3.2.1. Deployed Operations Management.** The offeror's proposal will be evaluated on the following:

- i. Effective workforce resource management at deployed and OCONUS locations:
  - a. Specific innovations to decrease response time from requirement tasking to requirement execution at new and existing deployed operating locations.
  - b. Demonstrates an effective approach to comply with foreign government requirements for deployed contractor personnel, to include but not limited to, country entry and exit requirements, work visas, work permits and/or residency permits.
  - c. Specific methods to integrate management of maintenance and aircrew personnel by site.

**M-2.2.3.2.2. Aircraft/GCS Availability Management.** The offeror's proposal will be evaluated on the following:

- i. Effective integrated processes and procedures to maintain both the fleet and each operating site service summary metrics as prescribed in the PWS. Demonstrates specific methods and any innovations to increase aircraft/GCS availability rates, and decrease total abort rates, repeat/recur rates and increase the 12-hour fix rate.
- ii. Effective approach to coordinate with necessary internal and external agencies for performance of approved Time Compliance Technical Orders, and identification and resolution of unanticipated and nonstandard aircraft/GCS discrepancies in minimal time.

### **M-2.2.3.3. Subfactor C: Transition**

**M-2.2.3.3.1. Transition Plan.** The offeror's proposal will be evaluated on the following:

- i. Realistic milestones to execute transition tasks in the mandated 120-day timeframe, across **XX** sites to include an explanation to incorporate program management functions and account for government furnished equipment and materials into your approach.
- ii. Effective organizational structure that includes appropriate number of personnel, functional assignments to effectively accomplish transition tasks.
- iii. Effective approach to hire qualified personnel to perform contract tasks and responsibilities upon commencement of contract performance period.
- iv. Effective process to acquire and integrate open actions (maintenance actions, requisitions etc.) upon commencement of contract performance period to ensure continuity and timely completion of open items.
- v. Effective approach for interfacing with the incumbent contractor in support of transition tasks.

### **M-2.3. Factor 2: Past Performance**

**M-2.3.1.** The Government will evaluate this factor to assess the offeror's recent and relevant present and past performance record to determine confidence in the offeror's probability of successfully performing the solicitation requirements. For purposes of this evaluation, the "offeror" includes any joint ventures, subcontractors and/or teaming partners proposed as part of the Prime Contractor's team under this effort. The Government will evaluate each offeror's recent and relevant demonstrated record of contract performance in supplying services that meet user's needs, including quality, cost and schedule.

**M-2.3.2. Recency.** A Recency determination will be made for each PPI reference provided and any additional sources found by the Government (PPI/Other Source). Recency is defined as active contract performance (minimum of 12 months) during the last five (5) years preceding the date of issuance of this solicitation. Contracts that were started prior to this time, but still in effect with active performance (minimum of 12 months) as of five (5) years from the date of this solicitation, will be considered recent. If a PPI reference is determined recent, the Government will evaluate the offeror's performance record during the entire contract period.

**M-2.3.3. Relevancy.** A relevancy determination of the offeror's present and past performance will be made for each recent PPI/Other Source. The Government will evaluate relevancy as "Very Relevant", "Relevant", "Somewhat Relevant", or "Not Relevant" according to the following criteria:

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY  
SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION – SEE FAR 2.101 AND 3.104

Rating	Definition
Very Relevant	Past or present performance effort: Managed an organizational and intermediate-level DOD MQ-1, MQ-9, and/or RQ-4 aircraft maintenance contract requiring weapons loading and unloading operations at CONUS and austere deployed locations with a total contract value greater than \$150M on a multi-year fixed price contract, IAW AS9100/9110 quality management system. LRE past performance effort: Managed multi-year MQ-1 and/or MQ-9 RPA contract operations providing aircrew to support DOD operations at CONUS and austere deployed locations.
Relevant	Past or present performance effort: Managed an organizational-level Federal RPA aircraft maintenance contract requiring weapons loading and unloading operations at CONUS and OCONUS locations with a total contract value greater than \$100M on a multi-year fixed price contract, IAW AS9100/9110 or ISO 9001 quality management system. LRE past performance effort: Managed multi-year RPA contract operations providing aircrew to support Federal operations at CONUS and OCONUS locations.
Somewhat Relevant	Past or present performance effort: Managed an organizational, intermediate, or depot level aircraft maintenance contract requiring weapons loading and unloading operations at CONUS or OCONUS locations with a total contract value greater than \$20M, utilizing a quality management system. LRE past performance effort: Managed RPA contract operations providing aircrew to support Federal operations at CONUS or OCONUS locations.
Not Relevant	Past or present performance effort did not involve any of the complexity or magnitude this effort requires.

**M-2.3.4.** For each recent and relevant PPI/Other Source evaluated, the Government will conduct an in-depth review and evaluation of all performance data obtained to determine the quality of recent/relevant PPI. The Government is not bound by the offeror's opinion of its performance. The Government may confirm past and present performance data identified by offerors in the proposals, and may obtain additional performance data from other sources. Past performance information may be obtained through, but not limited to, the following: 1) Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS); 2) Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System (FAPIIS); 3) Electronic Subcontract Reporting System (eSRS), or other data bases; 4) Defense Contract Management Agency (DCMA) channels; and 5) Interviews with Program Managers and Contracting Officers.

**M-2.3.5. Performance Confidence Assessment.** The rating for the Past Performance factor is based on evaluation of the offeror's past performance data, resulting in an overall performance confidence assessment. Each offeror will receive one overall performance confidence rating in accordance with the DoD Source Selection Procedures, as follows:

RATING	DEFINITION
Substantial Confidence	Based on the offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a high expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
Satisfactory Confidence	Based on the offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a reasonable expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.



FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY  
SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION – SEE FAR 2.101 AND 3.104

Neutral Confidence	No recent/relevant performance record is available or the offeror's performance record is so sparse that no meaningful confidence assessment rating can be reasonably assigned. The Offeror may not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on the factor of past performance.
Limited Confidence	Based on the offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a low expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
No Confidence	Based on the offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has no expectation that the offeror will be able to successfully perform the required effort.

**M-2.3.6.** Adverse past performance is defined as past performance information that supports 1) a less than satisfactory rating on any evaluation subfactor; or 2) any unfavorable comments received from sources without a formal rating system that cause evaluator concern. When a relevant performance record indicates performance problems, the Government will consider the number and severity of the problems and the appropriateness and effectiveness of any corrective actions taken (not just planned or promised). The Government may review more recent contracts or performance evaluations to ensure corrective actions have been implemented and to evaluate their effectiveness. In accordance with FAR 15.306(b)(4), communications must be held with any offeror who will be excluded from competition because of adverse past performance information, unless the offeror has previously had the opportunity to comment on such information.

**M-2.3.7.** Offerors without a record of relevant and recent past performance or for whom information on past performance is not available will not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably, and as a result, will receive a "Neutral Confidence" rating for the Past Performance factor as depicted in M-2.3.5.

**M-2.3.8.** Even though the assessment of past performance is separate and distinct from determination of responsibility required by FAR Part 9, past performance information evaluated may be used to support the determination of responsibility for the successful offeror.

**M-2.4. Factor 3: Price.** Price will be evaluated using techniques established in FAR 15.404-1 to ensure the Government receives a fair, reasonable, balanced and realistic price.

**M-2.5.** An offeror's proposed price must be determined fair and reasonable to be eligible for award. The total overall evaluated price consists of the sum total proposed price for all task orders issued with the RFP, and as updated via any amendments through award, to include all options, 50% of the last task order option period for the six month extension of services option IAW FAR 52.217-8 and offeror provided estimates for the cost-reimbursable CLINs.

**M-2.5.1. Part A – IDIQ Price Matrix**

**M-2.5.1.1.** A price analysis will be conducted in accordance with FAR 15.404-1 as outlined below. Price reasonableness will be determined based on a comparison of offeror's fully loaded labor rates proposed in the IDIQ price matrix located in Section B, Attachment Table B - Pricing Table and all priced options. Proposed fully loaded labor rates will be used to price task order requirements at contract award and serve as the ceiling rate for additional task orders throughout the life of this contract. Pricing table for CONUS locations will serve as the baseline for negotiations for adding sites that were not included in the price matrix at contract award.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY  
SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION – SEE FAR 2.101 AND 3.104

**M-2.5.1.2.** The preferred and intended price analysis technique will be the evaluation of offeror's pre-priced fully loaded labor rates, (as proposed in the IDIQ price matrix located in Section B, Attachment Table B - Pricing Table for all contract period of performance), and comparison of proposed prices in response to the solicitation. Other techniques and procedures as described in FAR 15.404-1 may be used to ensure a fair and reasonable price.

**M-2.5.2. Part B – Task Order Pricing**

**M-2.5.2.1.** A cost/price analysis will be conducted in accordance with FAR 15.404-1 as outlined below. Price reasonableness will be determined based on a comparison of offerors' total overall evaluated prices. The total overall evaluated price consists of the sum total proposed price of task orders issued with the RFP, and as updated via any amendments through award, to include all options and offeror provided estimates for the cost-reimbursable CLINs. IAW FAR 15.404-1(d)(2), cost realism analyses shall be performed on cost-reimbursement CLINs to determine the probable cost of performance for each offeror. Task order pricing shall be consistent with the offeror's fully loaded labor rates proposed in the IDIQ price matrix provided in Part A, Section B, Attachment Table B - Pricing Table, to include all priced options. Adjustments to the manpower requirements identified in the manning matrix provided in Volume I Part A are permitted, but shall be justified based on your technical solution for the unique task order requirements and must be clearly identified in the proposed price. Evaluation of options at the task order level shall not obligate the Government to exercise such options. Performance incentive will be excluded from the overall evaluated price as the Government determines the available pool amount.

**M-2.5.2.2.** Evaluation of Firm Fixed Price portions of the requirement will include comparison of proposed prices in response to the solicitation which is the preferred and intended price analysis technique. Other techniques and procedures as described in FAR 15.404-1 may be used to ensure a fair and reasonable price.

**M-2.5.2.3.** Evaluation of the Cost Reimbursable portions of the requirement will include a comparison of proposed costs in response to the solicitation and a review of the offeror's basis for cost estimating, as well as the application of any proposed indirect cost rates. Other techniques and procedures as described in FAR 15.404-1 may be used to ensure a fair and reasonable price.

**M-2.5.2.3.** Offerors are cautioned against submitting an offer with unbalanced pricing; see FAR 15.404-1(g). An example of an unbalanced offer would be proposed labor rates that are significantly less than or significantly overstated in relation to the proposed rates for other labor categories (either of the offeror's proposal or the same labor categories as proposed by other offerors). The Government may also consider an offer unbalanced if there is a significant difference between proposed labor rates in the same labor category between option periods or the proposed costs/prices from year to year are above what would be considered a reasonable adjustment for inflation. If any of the proposals are deemed unreasonable, incomplete, unbalanced or unrealistic, that Offeror will no longer be considered for award.

**M-2.5.3. Price Realism.** The Government will evaluate proposed prices to determine whether prices reflect a clear understanding of the requirements and are consistent with the various elements of the offeror's Technical Capability Proposal (reasonableness and completeness). Any inconsistency, whether real or apparent between promised performance/technical approach and price, shall be explained in the proposal. For example, if the intended use of new and innovative techniques is the basis for an apparently low price, the nature of these techniques and their impact on the cost or price shall be explained. Any significant inconsistency, if unexplained, raises a fundamental issue of the offeror's understanding of the nature and



FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY  
SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION – SEE FAR 2.101 AND 3.104

scope of the work required and its financial ability to perform the contract, and may be grounds for the rejection of the proposal. The burden of proof as to price credibility rests with the Offeror.

**M-2.6.3 Part C – Proposal Documentation**

**M-2.6.3.1 Supplemental Responsibility Determination - DoD Contract Security Classification Specification (DD Form 254).** DD Form 254 requirements will be assessed for contractor responsibility IAW FAR Part 9. The Government will use the Industrial Security Facilities Database (ISFD) to verify offeror and subcontractor(s) clearance information. The Government is not obligated to hold discussions nor delay the decision brief awaiting an offeror or subcontractor to comply with DD Form 254 classification requirement(s). Contractor responsibility includes:

1. Offeror and subcontractor(s) having the highest classification specification required on the DD Form 254 attached to this solicitation; and
2. If applicable, the offeror submitting a request for authorization to subcontract COMSEC work for each subcontractor.

**M.2.7 Factor 4: Small Business Participation.**

**M.2.7.1. Large Business Prime Contractors Only.** The Government will assess the offeror's proposed Small Business participation on an acceptable/unacceptable basis. To be determined acceptable, offerors shall demonstrate a progressive small business subcontract approach that complies with the requirements of FAR Part 19 and its supplements, while maximizing subcontracting opportunities. Offerors proposal shall demonstrate sound and effective methods to determine and meet goals, the extent to which offerors specifically identify and commit to use the small business in performance of the contract, whether as a joint venture, teaming arrangement or subcontractor and the past performance of the offeror in complying with the requirements of the clauses at FAR 52.219-8 and 52.219-9. The extent of small business participation shall be separate from the subcontracting plan submitted.

**M.2.7.2. Small Business Subcontracting Plan.** The Small Business Subcontracting Plan Checklist will be used to evaluate completeness of the plan. The minimum small business subcontracting goal for this requirement is 25% of total contract dollars at the IDIQ contract level. While offerors are invited to propose a higher overall small business subcontracting goal, proposals that exceed the 25% subcontracting goal will not receive higher ratings. Within an offeror's proposed total small business subcontracting goals, there is a minimum goal of 5 percent for Small Disadvantage Business concerns. In addition, the offeror shall comply with FAR 52.219-9 by also expressing goals in terms of percentages of total planned subcontracting dollars, for the use of small business, veteran-owned small business, service-disabled veteran-owned small business, HUBZone small business, small disadvantaged business, and women-owned small business concerns as subcontractors.